

## **REMARKS**

In response to the election and restriction requirements, Applicants select Group I, Claims 1-20, drawn to apparatus, classified in class 606, subclass 60. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's restriction between Groups I and II, however, because examining these claim sets makes practical sense in light of their similarities. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the restriction requirement so that Applicants do not needlessly spend money on a divisional application and the Examiner may work more efficiently.

Regarding the species election, Applicants elect Figure 15. Applicants, however, disagree with the species requirement given the similarities of Figures 2, 14, and 17 to Figure 15. While the distinctions between Figures 2 and 14 are noted in comparison to Figures 15 and 17, Applicants strongly question the Examiner's distinction between Figures 15 and 17 and respectfully request reconsideration.

Addressing the sub-species election required by the Examiner, Applicants elect Sub-Species III: All Non-Resorbable.

Considering Applicants' selection of Claims 1-20 in accordance with the restriction requirement, Applicants now state that the following claims are consonant with the elected species and sub-species: Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, and 18-20. Claims 7, 9, 16, 17, and 21-27 are withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 15, 2006

By:   
Michael Malinzak, Reg. No. 43,770

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MM:ca